

P&G Case 8313
Office Action dated October 24, 2003
Amendment dated February 24, 2004
Appl. Serial No. 10/003,946

11

REMARKS

By the amendments presented, Claims 5, 6, 13-15, 18-23, 26, and 27 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Also by the amendments presented, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the embodiment originally presented as Claim 43. Support for this amendment is found, at a minimum, in the original Claim 43 and in the Specification at Page 6, line 5.

Further by the amendments presented, Claim 3 has been amended to incorporate the silicones originally presented as part of Claim 15. Support for this amendment is found, at a minimum, in original Claim 15.

Still further by the amendments presented, Claim 4 has been amended to incorporate the silicones originally presented as part of Claim 43. Support for this amendment is found, at a minimum, in original Claim 43.

Also by the amendments presented, Claim 16 has been amended to be consistent with Claim 1 from which it depends.

Further by the amendments presented, Claims 24 and 25 have been amended to correct dependency and be consistent with earlier claim amendments.

Claim 29 has been amended to depend from Claim 1.

Claim 40 has been amended to clarify that the composition is a heavy duty laundry detergent and that it contains a laundry or dishwashing detergent adjunct. Support for this amendment is found, at a minimum, in the claims as originally presented.

Still Further, Claim 47 has been amended to further characterize the type and amount of material and clarify that the composition contains a laundry or dishwashing detergent adjunct. Support for this amendment is found, at a minimum, in the claims as originally presented.

Upon entry of the amendments presented, Claims 1-4, 7-12, 16, 24-29, 40-43 and 45-47 are pending in the present application. No new matter is believed to have been added. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

P&G Case 8313

Office Action dated October 24, 2003

12

Amendment dated February 24, 2004

Appl. Serial No. 10/003,946

ART REJECTIONS

35 USC § 102(b) over Glenn Jr.

Claims 1-16, 18-29, 40-42, and 45-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Glenn Jr., et al. (U.S. 5,885,948). The Office Action argues that Glenn Jr. teaches all of the elements of the present invention and therefore anticipates the present invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Glenn Jr. relates to skin-cleansing compositions that contain surfactants, polyglycols, and other moisturizing agents.

The claims of the present invention as amended herein require a heavy duty liquid laundry detergent composition which contains from 0.1% to 10% of a fabric substantive agent having limited solubility in said liquid detergent composition, wherein the fabric substantive agent is selected from silicon-moiety containing agents, anti-abrasion polymers, dye fixative agents, optical brighteners, fabric substantive perfumes, soil release polymers, photobleaches, bleaches, bleach precursors, and mixtures thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that Glenn Jr. does not teach a heavy duty liquid laundry detergent composition which contains from 0.1% to 10% of a fabric substantive agent having limited solubility in said liquid detergent composition, wherein the fabric substantive agent is selected from silicon-moiety containing agents, anti-abrasion polymers, dye fixative agents, optical brighteners, fabric substantive perfumes, soil release polymers, photobleaches, bleaches, bleach precursors, and mixtures thereof. Therefore, since Glenn Jr. does not teach each and every limitation of the present claims, Glenn Jr. cannot anticipate the claims of the present invention.

Given the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that since Glenn Jr. fails to teach each and every element of the claims of the present invention that the rejection of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Glenn Jr. is improper and should be withdrawn.

35 USC § 102(e) over Esser

Claim 47 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Esser, et al. (U.S. 6,241,976). The Office Action argues that Esser teaches all of the elements of the present invention and therefore anticipates the present invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Esser relates to anti-perspirant compositions that contain structurants and other additives.

P&G Case 8313

Office Action dated October 24, 2003

13

Amendment dated February 24, 2004

Appl. Serial No. 10/003,946

Claim 47 of the present invention as amended herein requires a heavy duty liquid laundry detergent composition which contains from 0.1% to 5% of a particular crystalline hydroxyl-containing stabilizer and a nonsurfactant adjunct suitable for laundry or dishwashing agents.

Applicants respectfully submit that Esser does not teach a heavy duty liquid laundry detergent composition which contains 0.1% to 5% of a particular crystalline hydroxyl-containing stabilizer and a nonsurfactant adjunct suitable for laundry or dishwashing agents. Therefore, since Esser does not teach each and every limitation of the present claims, Esser cannot anticipate the claims of the present invention.

Given the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that since Esser fails to teach each and every element of the claims of the present invention that the rejection of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Esser is improper and should be withdrawn.

35 USC § 102(e) over Beerse

Claims 1-16, 18-29, 40-43, and 45-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Beerse, et al. (U.S. 6,183,757). The Office Action argues that Beerse teaches all of the elements of the present invention and therefore anticipates the present invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Beerse relates to skin-cleansing compositions that contain surfactants, polyglycols, and other moisturizing agents. Beerse also exemplifies a liquid laundry detergent.

The claims of the present invention as amended herein require a heavy duty liquid laundry detergent composition which contains from 0.1% to 10% of a fabric substantive agent having limited solubility in said liquid detergent composition, wherein the fabric substantive agent is selected from silicon-moiety containing agents, anti-abrasion polymers, dye fixative agents, optical brighteners, fabric substantive perfumes, soil release polymers, photobleaches, bleaches, bleach precursors, and mixtures thereof in combination with from 0.1% to 10% of a crystalline hydroxyl-containing stabilizer.

Applicants respectfully submit that Beerse does not teach a heavy duty liquid laundry detergent composition which contains from 0.1% to 10% of a fabric substantive agent having limited solubility in said liquid detergent composition, wherein the fabric substantive agent is selected from silicon-moiety containing agents, anti-abrasion polymers, dye fixative agents, optical brighteners, fabric substantive perfumes, soil release polymers, photobleaches, bleaches, bleach precursors, and mixtures thereof in combination with from 0.1% to 10% of a crystalline hydroxyl-containing

P&G Case 8313

Office Action dated October 24, 2003

14

Amendment dated February 24, 2004

Appl. Serial No. 10/003,946

stabilizer. Therefore, since Beerse does not teach each and every limitation of the present claims, Beerse cannot anticipate the claims of the present invention.


Given the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that since Beerse fails to teach each and every element of the claims of the present invention that the rejection of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Beerse is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish their invention from the applied prior art. WHEREFORE, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments presented, reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 102(e), and allowance of Claims 1-4, 7-12, 16, 24-29, 40-43 and 45-47.

Respectfully submitted,

M. A. Smerznak

By 
Armina E. Matthews
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,780
(513) 627-4210

Dated: February 24, 2004
Customer No. 27752

8313 Response to OA Oct 24 '03.doc